Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 8 of 25

REMARKS

The Applicant's claimed invention is neither taught or suggested by the cited art.

Briefly, the cited art and exemplary claimed subject matter are generally described as

follows:

U.S. Patent No. 6,333,976 B2 to Lesley

Lesley provides a network-based solution for a subscriber's own prepayment and

own use of prepay telecommunications services. For example, Lesley permits a customer

to discontinue use of conventional prepaid telephone calling cards. The network-based

solution assigns a record in a database to the customer. A record in the database tracks the

customer's account number and an associated prepaid monetary value. When the

customer calls from a public telephone, the customer can request a telecommunication

service, and a monetary amount in the record can be decreased in accordance with the

service rendered. Lesley does not disclose or suggest a solution for a subscriber or user to

prepay a monetary amount for the use by or services rendered to another subscriber or

user.

U.S. Patent No. 6,185,545 B2 to Resnick et al.

Resnick et al. provides a network-based solution for a subscriber's prepayment of

the subscriber's own payment account that is set-up with a third-party merchant or another

commercial entity. For example, Resnick et al. provides a payment system for a customer

to make commercial transactions on his own behalf with a variety of merchants via a

financial network. Likewise, Resnick et al. does not disclose or suggest a solution for a

subscriber or user to prepay a monetary amount for the use of another subscriber or user.

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 9 of 25

Furthermore, Resnick et al. utilizes a financial network that utilizes completely different

network elements than a telecommunications network. Even when Resnick et al. is

combined with the teaching of Lesley, this combination of references does not disclose or

suggest the Applicant's claimed invention.

Exemplary Claimed Subject Matter

Inventive uses of a conventional billing message allow a caller to conduct a

transaction using a telecommunication system. Previously, a user generally could not use

the telecommunications systems except for conventional telecommunications services.

For example, a parent could not "buy a \$50 credit" to be applied to a son's or daughter's

telephone bill and to be charged as a \$50 debit to the parent's telephone bill. One of the

reasons such a transaction could not be conducted is because there was no means of

communication between the user and the billing system of the telecommunications system.

Without a means of communication, the user could not pass on the details of the desired

transaction, and the billing system could not carry out the transaction.

The problem of the lack of communication between the user and the billing system

is solved by the exemplary claimed invention's inclusion of transaction information in a

billing message. In exemplary embodiments, the billing message may be posted to or

obtained by the billing system from the telecommunications system.

In sum, the exemplary claimed inventions use billing messages in a novel manner

to effect a transfer of information and conduct a transaction.

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 10 of 25

I. THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(E)

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-7, 10-12, 14-23, 26-27, 29, 32-33, and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable. Specifically, the Office Action rejected these claims as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,333,976 to *Lesley*. Office Action, p. 2, paragraph 2. Claims 1, 10, 18, 26, and 34-36 are independent claims. Since one or more claimed elements in the independent claims are not taught or disclosed by *Lesley*, the Assignee submits that the cited reference does not teach or disclose the invention of Claims 1-7, 10-12, 14-23, 26-27, 29, 32-33, and 34-37.

Generally, *Lesley* omits elements of the Applicant's independent claims that relate to a subscriber's monetary prepayment for an account number other than the account number of the subscriber. *Lesley* also teaches away from these claim elements when the disclosure in *Lesley* states only the subscriber account number and the prepay account number identifying the subscriber's subscription to the network service can be stored in an associated database. Col. 7, lines 16-23. The differences between *Lesley* and each of the Applicant's independent claims are addressed in turn below.

Independent Claim 1

For the claimed system recited in amended Claim 1, *Lesley* does not specifically disclose the amended element of: "causing the intelligent network element to obtain a telecommunications account number and a transaction amount from the communication, the telecommunications account number corresponding to <u>a second</u> telecommunications account with respect to which the transaction is to be conducted in the billing system." (underlining added). Furthermore, Applicants' amended Claim 1 distinguishes between a <u>first</u> telecommunications account and a <u>second</u> telecommunications account. *Lesley* does

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 11 of 25

cited art.

not disclose any circumstance when the account differs from the calling line number associated with the calling line number account. Lesley discloses only a "subscriber account number field" for use with a transaction. Lesley is silent about prepaying monetary amounts to an account of another customer or user. In fact, Lesley defines the subscriber account number to be used as follows: "The subscriber account number corresponds to the number used to identify a subscriber's basic subscription to the communications network." Col. 7, lines 1-15. It is clear that the invention in Lesley was intended to be used for the prepayment of a subscriber's own telecommunication services and not for the prepayment or credit of another subscriber's account. Since the amended elements of Claim 1 are not disclosed, amended Claim 1 should be allowable over the

Independent Claim 10

For the claimed method recited in Claim 10, Lesley does not specifically disclose the element of: "obtaining an account number and a transaction amount from the communication, the account number corresponding to an account with respect to which a transaction is to be conducted, the account differing from a calling line number account associated with the calling line number" (underlining added). Again, Lesley does not disclose any circumstance when the account differs from the calling line number associated with the calling line number account. Lesley discloses only a "subscriber account number field" for use with a transaction. Lesley is silent about prepaying monetary amounts to an account of another customer or user. In fact, Lesley defines the subscriber account number to be used as follows: "The subscriber account number corresponds to the number used to identify a subscriber's basic subscription to the

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 12 of 25

communications network." Col. 7, lines 1-15. It is clear that the invention in Lesley was

intended to be used for the prepayment of a subscriber's own telecommunication services

and not for the prepayment or credit of another subscriber's account. Therefore, since all

of the elements of Claim 10 are not disclosed, Claim 10 should be allowable over the cited

art.

Independent Claim 18

For the claimed system recited in amended Claim 18, Lesley does not specifically

disclose the amended element of: "in response to obtaining of the billing message, making

a determination that the billing message includes an indication that a transaction is to be

conducted with respect to a telecommunications account in the system, the

telecommunications account differing from a calling line number account associated with

the calling line number" (underlining added). Again, Lesley does not disclose any

circumstance when the account differs from the calling line number associated with the

calling line number account. Lesley discloses only a "subscriber account number field" for

use with a transaction. Lesley is silent about prepaying monetary amounts to an account of

another customer or user. In fact, Lesley defines the subscriber account number to be used

as follows: "The subscriber account number corresponds to the number used to identify a

subscriber's basic subscription to the communications network." Col. 7, lines 1-15. It is

clear that the invention in Lesley was intended to be used for the prepayment of a

subscriber's own telecommunication services and not for the prepayment or credit of

another subscriber's account. Therefore, since all of the elements of amended Claim 18

are not disclosed, amended Claim 18 should be allowable over the cited art.

Independent Claim 26

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 13 of 25

For the claimed system recited in Claim 26, Lesley does not specifically disclose the telecommunication system recited in the preamble of: "In a telecommunications system wherein a billing message is created with respect to a communication, wherein the billing message is further created with respect to a calling line number account corresponding to a calling line number associated with the communication, and wherein the billing message is obtained by a billing system having access to the calling line number account and to other accounts, a method for execution of a transaction in the billing system between the calling line number account and one of the other accounts to which the billing system has access" (underlining added). Again, Lesley does not disclose any circumstance when the account differs from the calling line number associated with the calling line number account. Lesley discloses only a "subscriber account number field" for use with a transaction, Lesley is silent about prepaying monetary amounts to an account of another customer or user. In fact, Lesley defines the subscriber account number to be used as follows: "The subscriber account number corresponds to the number used to identify a subscriber's basic subscription to the communications network." Col. 7, lines 1-15. It is clear that the invention in Lesley was intended to be used for the prepayment of a subscriber's own telecommunication services and not for the prepayment or credit of another subscriber's account. Therefore, since all of the elements of Claim 10 are not disclosed, Claim 10 should be allowable over the cited art.

Independent Claim 34

For the claimed system recited in amended Claim 34, *Lesley* does not specifically disclose the amended element of: "based on the instructions from the service control point, causing the service switching point to obtain an account number and a transaction

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 14 of 25

amount from the communication, the account number corresponding to the account with respect to which the transaction is to be conducted in the billing system, the account differing from a calling line number account associated with the calling line number" (underlining added). Again, Lesley does not disclose any circumstance when the account differs from the calling line number associated with the calling line number account. Lesley discloses only a "subscriber account number field" for use with a transaction. Lesley is silent about prepaying monetary amounts to an account of another customer or user. In fact, Lesley defines the subscriber account number to be used as follows: "The subscriber account number corresponds to the number used to identify a subscriber's basic subscription to the communications network." Col. 7, lines 1-15. It is clear that the invention in Lesley was intended to be used for the prepayment of a subscriber's own telecommunication services and not for the prepayment or credit of another subscriber's account. Therefore, since all of the elements of amended Claim 34 are not disclosed,

Independent Claim 35

amended Claim 34 should be allowable over the cited art.

For the claimed method recited in amended Claim 35, Lesley does not specifically disclose the amended element of: "crediting or debiting an account other than the account associated with the calling line number by the transaction amount." (underlining added). Again, Lesley does not disclose any circumstance when the account differs from the calling line number associated with the calling line number account. Lesley discloses only a "subscriber account number field" for use with a transaction. Lesley is silent about prepaying monetary amounts to an account of another customer or user. In fact, Lesley defines the subscriber account number to be used as follows: "The subscriber account

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 15 of 25

number corresponds to the number used to identify a subscriber's basic subscription to the

communications network." Col. 7, lines 1-15. It is clear that the invention in Lesley was

intended to be used for the prepayment of a subscriber's own telecommunication services

and not for the prepayment or credit of another subscriber's account. Therefore, since all

of the elements of amended Claim 35 are not disclosed, amended Claim 35 should be

allowable over the cited art.

Independent Claim 36

For the claimed system recited in amended Claim 36, Lesley does not specifically

disclose the amended element of: "a billing system ... for recognizing the transaction

information in the billing message, and based on the recognition, for conducting the

transaction based on the transaction information, wherein the SCP is operative to code the

transaction amount into a field of the billing message and the account number into another

field of the billing message, and wherein the billing system is operative to decode the

transaction amount from the field of the billing message and account number from the

another field, and to credit or debit an account other than the account associated with the

account number by the transaction amount." (underlining and emphasis added). The

elements of Claim 37 have been incorporated into amended Claim 36 as shown. Again,

Lesley does not disclose any circumstance when the account differs from the calling line

number associated with the calling line number account. Lesley discloses only a

"subscriber account number field" for use with a transaction. Lesley is silent about

prepaying monetary amounts to an account of another customer or user. In fact, Lesley

defines the subscriber account number to be used as follows: "The subscriber account

number corresponds to the number used to identify a subscriber's basic subscription to the

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 16 of 25

communications network." Col. 7, lines 1-15. It is clear that the invention in Lesley was

intended to be used for the prepayment of a subscriber's own telecommunication services

and not for the prepayment or credit of another subscriber's account. Therefore, since all

of the elements of amended Claim 36 are not disclosed, amended Claim 36 should be

allowable over the cited art.

Dependent Claims 2-7, 11-12, 14-17, 19-23, 27, 29, and 32-33

Since these dependent claims rely upon independent claims for which reasons of

patentability have been previously addressed, all of these dependent claims should also be

allowable over the cited reference.

II. THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A)

The Office Action rejected Claims 13, 24-25, 28, and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable. Specifically, the Office Action rejected Claims 13, 24-25,

28, and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,333,976 to Lesley, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,545 to Resnick et al.

Office Action, p. 6, paragraph 4. Claims 13, 24-25, 28, and 30-31 are all dependent

claims. Since one or more of the claimed elements in Claims 13, 24-25, 28, and 30-31 are

neither taught or suggested by the combination of cited references, the Assignee submits

that these dependent claims are allowable over the cited references.

The Applicants' claimed invention is clearly distinguishable from both Lesley and

Resnick et al. As described above with respect to all of the independent claims, Lesley

omits elements of the Applicant's independent claims that relate to a subscriber's

monetary prepayment for an account number other than the account number of the

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 17 of 25

subscriber. Even when the disclosure of Resnick et al. is combined with the disclosure of

Lesley, the combination of cited references does not disclose or teach the Applicants'

claimed invention. In particular, Resnick et al. discloses the transmission of payments

from a credit card or debit card user to a point-of-sale merchant. The circumstances for

implementing the transaction in Resnick et al. are altogether different than the

circumstances for using a telecommunication network to conduct a transaction in the

Applicant's claimed invention. Further, the systems and methods disclosed by Resnick et

al. relate to financial networks (FIGs. 2, 8), and not a telecommunication network, thus the

network-type elements disclosed by Resnick et al. are not similar to or even analogous to

the telecommunication network elements in the Applicant's claimed invention.

Claim 13 is dependent from independent Claim 10. As previously discussed,

Claim 10 is not disclosed by Lesley. Resnick et al. relates to a financial network, not a

telecommunication network to which the Applicant's claimed invention pertains. The

network elements associated with a telecommunication network are different from and not

analogous to elements of a financial network. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that

dependent Claim 13 is neither suggested or taught by the combination of the cited

references.

Claims 24-25 ultimately depend from independent Claim 18. As previously

discussed, Claim 18 is not disclosed by Lesley. Resnick et al. relates to a financial

network, not a telecommunication network to which the Applicant's claimed invention

pertains. The network elements associated with a telecommunication network are different

from and not analogous to elements of a financial network. Therefore, it is respectfully

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 18 of 25

submitted that dependent Claims 24-25 are neither suggested or taught by the combination

of the cited references.

Claims 28, 30, and 31 ultimately depend from independent Claim 26. As

previously discussed, Claim 26 is not disclosed by Lesley. Resnick et al. relates to a

financial network, not a telecommunication network to which the Applicant's claimed

invention pertains. The network elements associated with a telecommunication network

are different from and not analogous to elements of a financial network. Therefore, it is

respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 28, 30, and 31 are neither suggested or

taught by the combination of the cited references.

Therefore, with respect to dependent Claims 13, 24-25, 28, and 30-31, the cited

references do not suggest or teach all of the recited claim elements and these claims should

be allowable over the cited references.

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 19 of 25

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

AMENDMENTS IN THE CLAIMS

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.121(c), the following version of the claims as

rewritten by the foregoing amendments show all the changes made relative to the previous

versions of the claims.

The invention I claim is:

1. (Twice Amended) In a telecommunications system functionally

interconnecting a service switching point, a service control point, and an intelligent

network element, and the telecommunications system including a billing system

functionally connected at least to the service control point for retrieval of billing messages,

the billing system including telecommunications accounts for charging fees to subscribers

with respect to telecommunications services provided to the subscribers, a method for

using a communication to conduct a transaction with respect to a telecommunications

account, comprising:

receiving the communication at the service switching point, the communication

being associated with a calling line number associated with a first telecommunications

account;

causing the service switching point to route the communication to the intelligent

network element;

causing the intelligent network element to obtain a telecommunications account

number and a transaction amount from the communication,

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 20 of 25

the telecommunications account number corresponding to [the] a

second telecommunications account with respect to which the transaction is to be

conducted in the billing system;

in response to obtaining the telecommunications account number and the

transaction amount, causing the intelligent network element to provide the

telecommunications account number, the transaction amount, and the calling line number

associated with the second telecommunications account and the communication to the

service control point;

in response to receipt of the telecommunications account number, the transaction

amount, and the calling line number associated with the second telecommunications

account, causing the service control point to make an assignment of the

telecommunications account number, the transaction amount, and the calling line number

associated with the second telecommunications account to a billing message; and

causing the billing system to retrieve the billing message from the service control

point,

to note the assignment of the telecommunications account number, the

transaction amount, and the calling line number associated with the second

telecommunications account to the billing message, and

based on the assignment, to conduct the transaction in the billing system

with respect to the second telecommunications account associated with the

telecommunications account number by crediting or debiting the second

telecommunications account by at least the transaction amount.

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 21 of 25

18. (Twice Amended) In a system for billing fees to subscribers for provision

of telecommunications services, each subscriber having a telecommunications account in

the system, the telecommunications account being associated with at least one calling line

number, a method to conduct a transaction with respect to a telecommunications account

in the system, comprising:

obtaining a billing message generated as a result of a telecommunications service

performed with respect to a calling line number;

in response to obtaining of the billing message, making a determination that the

billing message includes an indication that a transaction is to be conducted with respect to

a telecommunications account in the system, the telecommunications account differing

from a calling line number account associated with the calling line number; and

in response to the determination, conducting the transaction with respect to the

telecommunications account.

34. (Twice Amended) In a telecommunications system functionally

interconnecting a service switching point, a service control point, and an intelligent

network element, and the telecommunications system including a billing system

functionally connected at least to the service control point for retrieval of billing messages,

the billing system including accounts for conducting transactions, a method for using a

communication to conduct a transaction with respect to an account, comprising:

receiving the communication at the service switching point, the communication

being associated with a calling line number;

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 22 of 25

causing the service switching point to obtain instructions regarding the

communication from a service control point;

based on the instructions from the service control point, causing the service

switching point to obtain an account number and a transaction amount from the

communication,

the account number corresponding to the account with respect to which the

transaction is to be conducted in the billing system, the account differing from a calling

line number account associated with the calling line number;

in response to obtaining the account number and the transaction amount, causing

the service switching point to provide the account number, the transaction amount, and the

calling line number associated with the communication to the service control point;

in response to receipt of the account number, the transaction amount, and the

calling line number, causing the service control point to make an assignment of the

account number, the transaction amount, and the calling line number to a billing message

by including the account number, the transaction amount, and the calling line number in

the billing message and by posting the billing message for obtaining by the billing system;

and

causing the billing system to retrieve the billing message from the service control

point,

to note the assignment of the account number, the transaction amount, and

the calling line number to the billing message, and

In re Application of: Malik Serial No. 09/287,023 Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 23 of 25

based on the assignment, to conduct the transaction in the billing system with respect to the account associated with the account number by crediting or debiting the account by at least the transaction amount.

35. (Amended) A method for executing a transaction, comprising:

receiving a communication associated with a calling line number;

obtaining a transaction amount from the communication;

coding the transaction amount and the calling line number into a billing message;

posting the billing message;

obtaining the billing message, and decoding the transaction amount and the calling

line number from the billing message; and

crediting or debiting an account other than the account associated with the calling

line number by the transaction amount.

36. (Amended) A system for allowing a user to initiate a transaction and have

the transaction conducted, comprising:

a service switching point (SSP)

for receiving a communication from the user, and

for obtaining and acting on instructions regarding the communication;

a service control point (SCP)

for providing the instructions regarding the communication to the SSP, the

instructions instructing the SSP to retrieve transaction information and to forward the

transaction information to the SCP,

Filing Date: April 6, 1999

Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002

Page 24 of 25

for including the transaction information in a billing message by assigning the transaction information to at least a field of the billing message, and

for posting the billing message for retrieval by a billing system; and

the billing system

for retrieving the billing message,

for recognizing the transaction information in the billing message, and

based on the recognition, for conducting the transaction based on the

transaction information, wherein the SCP is operative to code the transaction amount into

a field of the billing message and the account number into another field of the billing

message, and wherein the billing system is operative to decode the transaction amount

from the field of the billing message and account number from the another field, and to

credit or debit an account other than the account associated with the account number by

the transaction amount.

37. (Cancelled)

In re Application of: Malik Serial No. 09/287,023 Filing Date: April 6, 1999 Response to Office Action Mailed May 23, 2002 Page 25 of 25

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons given above, the Assignee respectfully submits that Claims 1-36 define allowable subject matter in view of the amendments and remarks made above. Further, the Assignee respectfully requests allowance of the claims and notice thereof. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below. No additional fees are believed due; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher J. Chan Reg. No. 44,070

Attorney for Assignee

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP 1100 Peachtree Street, N.E. Suite 2800 Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530 (404) 815-6500 (main) (404) 815-6555 (fax)

Attorney Docket No.: 36968/176677 Attorney File No.: 36968/176677